UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/594,290	05/07/2007	Katsuya Takigawa	AK-525XX	6319	
WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN, GAGNEBIN & LEBOVICI LLP TEN POST OFFICE SQUARE			EXAMINER		
			WEISS, PAMELA HL		
BOSTON, MA 02109			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1797		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			11/24/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/594,290	TAKIGAWA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	PAMELA WEISS	1797	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 16 November 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, wwith 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (the MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the slipset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount nortened statutory period for reply original.	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS	the standards the state of Citizens a belon	20 1 h 1 1 h -	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett	sideration and/or search (see NO ⁻ v);	ΓE below);	
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reig	ected claims	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	orroopending number of finding region	otou olamno.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):			
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an ex	planation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,7,8 and 10-14</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	sufficient reasons why the affidav	it or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attache	∍d.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application ir	condition for allowan	e because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (In the state of the sta	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/pw/	/Ellen M McAvoy/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1797	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant is attempting to amend the claims to change the required component C which may be chosen from various C groups which each have specified variables to overcome the cited reference and to further distinguish the C-1-1 group cited by the referenced from the claims. The amended claims appear to change the defined C-2 group in such as way as to overcome the citations previously relied upon in the primary reference thereby requiring further seach. However, the amendment does not overcome the disclosure of C-1-1 n-oleyl sarcosonic acid. It is unclear how the N-oleyl sarcosinic acid of Table 2 which is Ciba's Sarkosil O (or the other sarcosinic acids as disclosed in [0040]) fails to meet the formula limitations of component C-1-1. Applican'ts arguments are not commensurate with the scope of the claims as no requirement for n-oleoyl sarcosine is required, only a composition meeting the limitation of the formula C-1-1. It is also noted that the N-oleoyl sarcosine is not defined by CAS number in the specification or in the claims and it unclear where the CAS number relied upon in the Remarks was identified. For the aforementioned reasons, the rejections previously set forth have not been overcome by the proposed amendment or the Remarks.